springs at least as early as the Tang. To it many Sung writers contributed. To give even the names of them all would burden this narrative overmuch with details. The most prominent, however, must be mentioned. Shao Yung (1011-1077) was a forerunner. He persistently declined to accept public office, preferring to live in poverty and have leisure for thought. However, many sought his counsel, among them some of the most prominent leaders of the anti-Wang An-shih group, and his writings had a marked influence. He made a special study of the *I Ching.* He was a mystic, much of whose thinking had a Taoist origin.

Chou Tun-i (1017-1073), a native of the present Hunan, is the next of the chief contributors. Through most of his mature life he held office, and usually his literary pursuits had to be carried on in intervals snatched from administrative and judicial duties. Although reckoned as in the stream of Confucian tradition, he was influenced by both Taoism and Buddhism. Chou Tun-i was for a time the teacher of the next two important members of the school, Ch'eng Hao (whose years were 1032-1085 and who is also known as Ch'eng Ming-tao) and Ch'eng I (whose years were 1033-1107 and who is also known as Ch'eng I-ch'uan), and for him they had the greatest respect. The sons of an official of sturdy, independent character, an opponent of Wang An-shih, they shared their father's political views. Both also continued the family tradition by holding office, but the younger spent much of his time in retirement and study. They wrote voluminously,, chiefly essays and letters, and Ch'eng I, with his longer life and greater freedom from official cares, thought through a philosophy more fully than did his brother. An uncle of the

two Ch'engs, Chang Tsai (1020-1076), by his teaching and writings aided the growth of the school.

Chu Hsi (1130-1200) was younger than any of the preceding, and, in consequence, was able to take advantage of their labors. The son of an official, the service of the state claimed most of his adult years and he seems to have performed his duties with fidelity and ability. By disposition, however, he was more the scholar than the administrator and had intervals of retirement, some of them voluntary and with sinecure positions which gave him leisure for study, but at least one of them due to the opposition of enemies at court. During one period of his life he was